

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Office Action dated January 14, 2005, please consider the following remarks.

In the Office Action issued January 14, 2005, claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 12-15, and 19, and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitkow, U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0016786 (Pitkow) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,377 to Kravets (Kravets). Claims 7-9, 16-18, and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitkow in view of Kravets and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,696 to Hofmann (Hofmann).

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 12-13, 16-19, 21-22, and 25-27 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. Claims 5-6, 14-15, and 23-24 have been cancelled.

The present invention is not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, the references relied upon in the Office Action, as the prior art references do not disclose or suggest the claimed features of the present invention.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to claims 1, 3-4, 10, 12-13, 19, and 21-22 is not obvious over Pitkow in view of

Kravets because the combination of Pitkow and Kravets does not disclose all of the requirements of the present invention.

Pitkow discloses a search and recommendation system that employs the preferences and profiles of individual users and groups within a community of users, as well as information derived from categorically organized content pointers, to augment Internet searches, re-rank search results, and provide recommendations for objects based on an initial subject-matter query.

Pitkow discloses generating recommendations based on bookmarks stored by the user, and in particular using subject, context, and relevance feedback and the popularity, frequency of use, and recency of use of the bookmarks. In particular, Pitkow discloses generating recommendations using the data in a bookmark database (See [0050]). By contrast, the present invention, for example, according to claim 1, requires a recommendation database generated by performing the steps of performing data mining using users search query logs, user search patterns, and user profile information to generate a plurality of recommendations relating to search query strings based on the users search query logs, user search patterns, and user profile information, generating a data structure including the recommendations relating to search query strings, and generating a text index based on information in the data structure. The database disclosed by Pitkow does not disclose or suggest a database that stores recommendations generated as recited. Pitkow only discloses a database that stores bookmarks that

have been created by users of the system. Although Pitkow discloses performing a number of data access operations on the bookmarks, the database itself is just a bookmark database, not a recommendation database, as required by the present invention.

Kravets discloses a tool to be used with a search engine for an information management system includes methods for refining, filtering, and organizing search queries and search results. Kravets discloses a database that tracks a student's navigation of pages related to a course that a student is taking. When the student submits a query that is to be limited to particular pages that the student visited during a particular period, the database generates a dynamic set of URLs which represents the pages the student visited during that period. (See Col. 9, lines 4-15) Kravets does not disclose or suggest a recommendation database that is generated as required by the present invention, for example, according to claim 1.

Thus, the combination of Pitkow and Kravets still fails to disclose the required recommendation database that is generated as required by the present invention, for example, according to claim 1.

The present invention, according to claim 1, and according to claims 10 and 19, which are similar to claim 1, as well as according to claims 3-4, 12-13, and 21-22, which depend from claims 1, 10, and 19 respectively, is not unpatentable over the combination of Pitkow and Kravets.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to claims 7-9, 16-18, and 25-27 is not unpatentable over Pitkow in view of Kravets and further in view of Hofmann because the combination of Pitkow, Kravets, and Hofmann does not disclose all of the requirements of the present invention.

Hofmann discloses a system that implements a method for personalized filtering of information and automated generation of user-specific recommendations. However, Hofmann does not disclose or suggest a recommendation database that is generated as required by the present invention, for example, according to claim 1.

Thus, the combination of Pitkow, Kravets, and Hofmann still fails to disclose the required recommendation database that is generated as required by the present invention, for example, according to claim 1.

Thus, the present invention, according to claims 7-9, 16-18, and 25-27 is not unpatentable over Pitkow in view of Kravets and further in view of Hofmann.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

**Additional Fees:**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (19111.0051).

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Schwartz  
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: June 16, 2005

Swidler Berlin LLP  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20007  
(202) 424-7500